



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

basse, was born at Cremona in 1664; he reached his eighty-third year, and continued working until his death in 1717. A pupil of the Amati, he worked a long time with them, and upon their models. Toward 1700, he left them, and from that time, changed his proportions—increased his form—lowered his bellies, and was as fastidious in the degrees of thickness of the wood, as he was in the choice of the wood he employed. Contrary to the principles of the older Italian masters, the thickness increases toward the centre, in order to give support to the bridge upon which the tension of the string bears; and diminishes gradually toward the flanks of the instrument. All is calculated, in the works of this excellent artist, for the better production of tone. To these advantages are superadded equality in all the strings, grace of form, finish of detail, and brilliancy of varnish. In a large concert-room, a good violin of Joseph Guarneri has more power of sonority; but in a drawing-room, nothing can possibly equal the brilliant mellowness of a well preserved Straduari. Unfortunately, many have fallen into unskillful hands.

The family of the Guarneri, or *Guarnerius*, has also become illustrious for the manufacture of bow instruments. This family was also originally of Cremona, and constantly resided there, with the exception of Pierre Guarneri, who settled at Mantua, and still resided there in 1747. The most celebrated of these makers is Joseph Guarneri, called *Guarneri del Gesu*, from his violins bearing the mark IHS. He was born at Cremona, at the close of the seventeenth century. It is said that he learned his trade in the workshop of Straduari, but he never attained his master's delicacy of finish; on the contrary, his work evidences, very frequently, great carelessness. His F's, nearly straight and angular, are badly shaped; his purfling badly traced; in fact, his instruments carry no masterly appearance, and one is tempted to believe that the excellent quality of their tone arises more from the happy choice of material than from studied principles. Nevertheless, on close inspection, it is evident positive principles guided him in the construction of his instruments—as he has copied no maker who preceded him. He had two patterns, one small, the other large, the bellies slightly raised, and their thickness rather exceeding that of Straduari. The large patterns which proceed from Joseph Guarneri, are few in number, and rarely met with. It was upon one of these instruments that Paganini played at all his concerts. The tone of these instruments is exceedingly brilliant, and carries to a great distance; but the tone is less round and mellow than the instruments of Straduari, and please less near than at a certain distance.

After Straduari and Joseph Guarneri, the art seems to have attained its highest point of excellence, and the Italian makers appear not to have sought to improve, contenting themselves with copying the one or the other of these masters. Laurent Guadagnini, pupil of Straduari, copied the small patterns of his master. The first and second strings of his violins possess brilliancy and roundness, but the third is unfortunately muffled. He had a son, who worked at Milan until toward the end of 1770, following the style of his father; but his instruments are less sought after. The Gagliani also copied the Straduari, but their instruments are far from equaling those of the master; doubtless from want of care in the selection

of material. Reggieri and Alvani copied the form of Joseph Guarneri; they produced good violins, but are less valuable than the Straduari.

The Tyrol lays claim to some excellent makers of bow instruments, the chief of whom is Jaques Steiner, who was born about 1620, at Absone, a village near Inspruck. This celebrated maker, at three different periods, changed his make; firstly, while pupil of the Amati at Cremona—the violins of this period are admirably finished, and are extremely scarce. The belly is more raised than the Amati, the scrolls longer and wider in the lower part. All the labels of these violins are written and signed in his own handwriting. One of these magnificent instruments, bearing the date of 1644, was the property of Gardel, ballet-master of the opera at Paris, who performed upon it successfully in the ballet of *La Dansomanie*. Secondly, when established at Absone, after having married, he produced an immense quantity of instruments, carelessly finished, from 1650 to 1667. However, after having led a life of poverty for several years, obliged to hawk his own violins, which he sold for *six florins* each, he received orders from some noblemen, which improved his position. His genius from this period took a new flight, and he produced some splendid instruments, which are recognized by the scrolls, which represent heads of animals; by the close veining of his bellies, by the close and even small ribs, and by the varnish, resembling red mahogany faded by time into a brown color. Steiner was assisted at this time by his brother Marc, who, later, entered the order of Brother Hermits—by the three brothers Klots (Mathias, George, and Sebastian), and by Albani, all of whom were his pupils. The reproach attached to Steiner's instruments of possessing a nasal tone, apply only to those of this period, the labels of which are printed; there are, however, some admirable instruments of this same period, which were in the possession of the violinist Ropiquet, of the Marquis de las Rosas, a grandee of Spain, of the Count de Marp, a Parisian amateur, and of Frey, an artist of the opera, and publisher of music. There is an excellent tenor of the third period, formerly the property of M. Matrot de Preville, governor of the port of L'Orient.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A GERMAN PROFESSOR ON RICHARD WAGNER.*

Professor Eckart, of Munich, has followed up a lecture on Borne and Heine, by two more, one on Robert Schumann, and the other on Richard Wagner. With regard to that on Schumann, I must be satisfied with stating that Eckart drew an animated and attractive picture of this unhappy composer, a picture that appeared to have been inspired by the fantastic romanticism of T. A. Hoffman. It would seem unjust were I to be silent on his last lecture as well, and, therefore, I will state a few of the instances in which I differ from his delusive and seductive paradoxes. By way of introduction, Eckart casts a glance upon Italian and French music, which, according to him, are in course of being ruined by Verdi and Berlioz, while Gounod has joined the ranks of

the Germans.* This new preponderating influence achieved by German music,† has, according to Eckart, been won by the German Music of the Future, which owes its rise to no other than Beethoven. It was he who gave music an entirely new and fruitful purport, by expressing powerfully in musical shape, the ideas of liberty and fate—the heights and depths of the human mind. Since then, music no longer mirrors the affairs of the heart; its rhythm discloses generally the nature of the soul. Music has become a language of our ideas. This higher object explains also the necessity of the dissonance, the power of which, for the purposes of characterization, is just as indispensable as the dark background is to the painter for showing off his brilliant figures.‡ One leading fact to be steadfastly kept in mind is that mental art is poetry; the more, therefore, music strives after idealization, the more must it approach poetry. The science of Aesthetics cannot, however, be made to agree with Wagner's assertion, that Beethoven is the greatest of all instrumentalists, and that after his Ninth Symphony no other is possible. Even Liszt combated this mistake of his friend, not, it is true, by the so-called Programme—music, of which, also, Beethoven must be considered the originator in his "Pastoral Symphony," but by setting up as his programme, works of poetry, already existing, whether of a dramatic, an epic, or a lyrical description. The final impression of all art is musical in its nature.§

The indescribable elevation of mood and feeling which is left in our breast by a poem or a work of art, can receive really adequate expression from music alone. Even the Jupiter of Phidias can thus furnish a motive for a musician; and if Beethoven found, in his "Eroica," for instance, the model form of musical expression for an objectively historical subject, why should not music take for its theme the shape of a Columbus, of a Faust, nay, of a Schiller—why not that of an entire century, of an entire people, the essence of a definite historical epoch, such as that of the migration of a nation, or that of the French Revolution? It is in such tasks that its future lies!||

* But only as far as the subject is concerned. That Gounod's music to "Faust" is German in its character, is something we hear for the first time.

† Eckart means: which it has achieved abroad; but that Mozart and Weber, who, more than anyone else, paved the way in Paris for German music, did so because

‡ Had Eckart said that the dissonance is a dialectic moment, he would be less liable to be misunderstood than when he declares it necessary for "characterization." Mozart, whom Eckart himself designates the Shakespeare of Tone, is likewise, in Eckart's own words, unrivalled in musical characterization, and yet he did not require the dissonance for this, at least not in the same sense and the same degree as the Musicians of the Future.

§ But only for musically organized individuals, otherwise we should have to add: every final impression of an elevated nature must be musical, inasmuch as it awakens elevated sentiments. But what are we to do with such half-truths?

|| Eckart has here, perhaps unconsciously, characterized very accurately the monstrousness and exaggeration of the new era. The arbitrariness of the proceeding consists in the fact that the proper title of a piece of music appears almost more important than the purport. A symphony might be composed with the title, "The Cathedral of Cologne." Why should it not be? Anyone, however, hearing it, and not knowing the title, might refer it quite as well to any other elevated theme, such, for instance, as the "Moses" of Michael Angelo, Shakespeare, or the Alps. A title should prevent this, but then we should be partially depending upon the efforts of others, since the ideas created by another person's work are turned to his own advantage by the musician. In addition to this, it is taken for granted that in every case the hearer is conversant with the foreign non-musical motive. This, to put the matter mildly, is to graft art upon art, and the same weighty objections which were formerly raised against the so-called "Kunstlerdrama," as a sickly abortion, may be repeated in the present instance.

* From the Berlin Echo. The notes by the German writer.

After a retrospective glance at the spirit of Oratorio, as well as at the efforts made in the domain of religious—but, be it well observed, not of church—music, in so far as Mendelssohn, Schumann, Liszt, and Richard Wagner (for instance, in his "Liebesmahl der Apostel"), as well as others, have produced admirable works of this description, Eckart proceeds to consider more minutely the nature of Opera, that hermaphrodite in which, according to the assertion of celebrated aestheticians, two equal powers, music and drama, are combined.

At the head of the drama stood France; at the head of opera, Italy, says Eckart.* It was reserved for Germany to unite both. The efforts made for this purpose are not new, for they began a century ago. Were opera defined as a drama which succeeds in representing the rise and conflicts, as well as the elevation, of individual sentiment into the expression of large masses by means of tone on a verbal foundation, and a dramatic plot, contending parties might find in this explanation the means of coming to an understanding. The drama connected with opera has not remained the drama of spoken language. It has, as far as possible, done away with motives, action, and characterization, to limit itself to sentiment; but the music, also, is no longer simply music; it has to raise itself from mere melody to characterization. How the two elements could become one, Gluck has shown in a very well known instance, namely: his "Alceste." Eckart adduces utterances of his, such as: "When I am working at an opera, I have to begin by forgetting that I am a musician."† Gluck himself met with a great deal of opposition. The aim he had in view was the reform of "the noblest of theatrical entertainments," (*Schauspiele*) "in which all the arts have an equal share." This enmity against what is new, the lecturer further illustrated by Zelter's well known depreciatory opinion of Weber's "Freischütz." Gluck, however, was all the more emphatically acknowledged, not only by the people, but also by the poets. Lessing, Klopstock, and Herder, looked upon him as the hero of modern times. Compared to him, Mozart was reactionary since he again made music the ruler, degraded poetry into a servant, and even permitted prose. But in musical characterization he surpasses Gluck and all who come after him. He is a Shakespeare of tone.‡ The reaction against Gluck culminates in Rossini, but, on the other hand, though in different manners, Weber, Meyerbeer, Auber, Lortzing, Berlioz, Schumann, and Mendelssohn, all adopted a course calculated to restore music to the arms of poetry. "Tannhäuser" awoke in the Venusberg; German music turned from the domain of sensuality to prayer and penance—to poetry.§

they belong to the Music of the Future, is another novelty for us—at least it is a bold assertion.

* This sentence again sounds like a paradox. Where and when did France ever march at the head of the drama? The time of Racine, Corneille, and later, Voltaire, appear to be brought in only for the sake of effect, since neither with the development of our drama, nor of our opera, has it the least in the world to do.

† Gluck meant, probably, by this, something analogous to the assertion of the poet who should say that he must forget all about lyric poetry directly he writes a drama.

‡ This sentence, if further carried out, would, of necessity, so shake all the deductions made by the Musicians of the Future that it would be impossible to consider them as anything more than merely preparatory and transitory; or, at the most, as the adequate musical expression of an incomplete epoch, struggling and struggling and fermenting everywhere.

§ Although Eckart expressly denies any intention of speaking either for or against Wagner, we must dis-

Eckart now gives a sketch of R. Wagner's life—that is, of his musical life. We will here touch upon only a few separate points. It was Weber's "Freischütz" which made Wagner decide on devoting himself to music. It was the impression produced by Beethoven which excited him to write a pastoral, whereof the music and words sprang up simultaneously. The year 1830 with its storms, passed by Wagner without affecting him. A sketch for "Kosziusko" was laid aside, and, instead of it, after "Gozzi," he wrote "Die Feen," an opera interesting from the fact that it in Wagner first glorifies the principal figure recurring in most of his works, namely, that of the loving and self-sacrificing woman. This opera is also remarkable for being a fellow to his "Lohengrin." In his next epoch, characterized by a deep study of Italian and French music, he felt induced to turn Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure" into an opera. This was followed, in the year 1838, by "Rienzi," which betrayed the influence of Spontini. He had finished two acts of it in Riga, when he felt impelled to go to Paris. On his way, he was flung by a storm at sea on the coast of Norway—an incident which he turned to account in "Der fliegende Holländer," which, fortunately did not prevent him from completing "Rienzi," as well as "Der fliegende Holländer." In the last work, the idea of which Eckart, in a rare fit of gushiness, ranks with the Odyssey and the Ahasver, Wagner for the first time left the ordinary libretto. During his stay in Paris, moreover, the folk's book of "Tannhäuser" fell into his hands, subsequently leading him to the study of our great old German epics, as well as into the legendary world of the North. At Dresden, whither he had been summoned as conductor, in 1843, "Tannhäuser" sprang into life. "On the artistically elevated character of this creation," said Eckart, "Posterity will pronounce a milder judgment than that of the present day."

The impression produced by "Tannhäuser" throughout Germany, was a very powerful one. People felt that a time would perhaps come when the drama, as in former days, would again form part of the service of religion.* As a satirical production, followed "Die Meistersänger Nürnberg." Specimens of this do not give a favorable idea of Wagner's comic talent. In "Lohengrin," the idea of which Eckart ranks with the myths of Jupiter and Semele, of Eros and Psyche, Wagner strove to attain the highest pitch of dramatic lucidity; but he found neither the public nor the artists he required, and therefore—says Eckart—he joined the Revolution (?). How little of a politician Wagner was, is proved by the fact that, at the very time all Europe was in a ferment, he came to a full consciousness of his artistic aims.† He was nearly deciding

nate the above comparison as something extremely hazardous, especially as it just reverses the truth so far as music is concerned. All persons agree that not only does Wagner's music not renounce a sensual character, but absolutely carries it to the very highest pitch. It would, therefore, be far more correct to say: Wagner, it is true, delivered music from the Venusberg of Italy, but immediately conducted it to a new Venusberg of his own invention.

* That such a notion has been entertained after the Passion Plays of the Oberammergau, is well-known and intelligible; but the assertion of such a thing after "Tannhäuser," is an unparalleled specimen of Aesthetic Chauvinism!

† It is thus we understand this sentence, though the next one indirectly asserts just the contrary. When "Europe was fermenting" Wagner also appears to have been going through a by no means clear process of fermentation himself.

for the spoken drama; that is, nearly deciding on himself becoming a dramatist. With regard to his next plans, he wavered between Siegfried and Barbarossa, but the mass of action in the latter historical subject overwhelmed him. He concluded from this, that man alone should be the supreme hero of the true work of art, but that this was impossible under the pressure of historical accessory matter, and he, therefore, rejected drama, not for itself alone, but also theoretically and generally,* returning to the "Nibelungen Saga." Driven from Dresden, he fled to Switzerland, where he finished "Tristan und Isolde." His return to Germany, and his last work—which, since Schnorr's death, lies, probably forever, bound with crape, in Wagner's desk—are so nearly connected with the present that they do not fall within the sphere of discussion. In conclusion, Eckart recapitulates the leading features of Wagner's operas. The principal difference between Wagner and his predecessors and contemporaries, consists in his selecting the Myth and the Saga as operative subjects. It is his aim to employ music not as an artistic means, but as a kind of nature, as if the heroes of this legendary world—supposing the period of the Myth ever really existed—would not have spoken, but have sung.† The speaker tacks on to this the following reflections. Historical heroes could not be introduced singing, and made operative heroes, because, transformed into beings of sentiment, they would lose in our eyes.‡ With regard to the qualities peculiar to Wagner's operas, Eckart concludes by mentioning the absence of melody, the heaping-up of instrumental effects, and the banishment, on principle, of all monologues—that is, of all airs. It is, therefore, with perfect identity of opinion, that we subscribe the conclusions at which Eckart arrives in his lecture—namely, that Wagner's successor (that is, the Wagner of the Future) will have to follow Mozart, and once more restore melody as musical characteristic to all its rights; that opera and spoken drama must for ever remain separate; and that the dream of the "Work of Art of the Future" in which all the arts working together, must sacrifice their own peculiar nature, will never be aught but an illusion.

BADEN-BADEN.—M. Alary recently gave a concert, in which Mesdames Grisi, Viardot-Garcia, and Signor Mario took part. The following was the programme: Duet, "Per Valli per Boschi," Blangini; "Qui la Voce," Bellini; Air (Mario); Duet, "Ebben a te ferisci," and aria, "Pensa alla Patria," Rossini; Romance, "Raggio d'Amore," Donizetti; "Love Song," Alary; two Mazurkas, Chopin (arranged for the voice by Madame Viardot-Garcia); Irish Song, Moore; and Duet, "D'un tenero Core," Donizetti.

* Eckart would have done better to omit this sentence, for it reminds us of the fable of the Fox and Grapes.

† Another delusive phrase. Would anyone assert that Homer wished to propagate the illusion that if the period of the Myth then really existed, his Gods and Heroes would actually have spoken in hexameters? This is either meant as a joke or is an exaggeration of what we usually understand in art.

‡ With this, again, it is impossible to agree. Why should we not represent historical heroes as beings of sentiment as well as anyone else? "Bellisario," and Meyerbeer's "Prophète," are proofs we may. The reason why, for instance, Gustavus Adolphus or Napoleon would be ridiculous as operative heroes, is that they are too near to us. Eckart himself says that we might take Mahomet, though not Luther, as the hero of an opera.